



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,458	01/30/2002	Fumiaki Arai	58122-2 CCD	6616

7590 11/15/2004

Christopher C. Dunham
c/o Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Ave. of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

PARKER, FREDERICK JOHN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1762

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/060,458

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Frederick J. Parker

Art Unit

1762

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frederick J. Parker.

(3) _____.

(2) Christopher Dunham

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10-28-04

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: Onita et al vs 5843520

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

In response to my inquiry, Mr. Dunham called to discuss issues in this case, which boiled down to (1) is it inherent that silicone release agent produce critical water in oil emulsion? (2) Ex. 2 of Declaration of 10/4/04 is non-porous and completely contrary to clm 11, except clm 11 states the resultant film is porous. Mr Dunham argued the statement is the crucial difference, the Exam rebutted obviously a critical aspect of the invention (e.g. order of mixing, etc) is omitted & must be present to be patentable. It was understood the water-in-oil emulsion is the template for the porosity in the porous resin layer. Mr. Dunham will request clarification from clients to overcome these issues, which is appreciated by the Examiner.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required